

Appl. No. 10/822,125

Reply to Office action of May 14, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Regarding clauses 4-5 of your examination report, I have amended the 3 clauses of independent method claim 11 accordingly so that they refer specifically to computerized means.
2. Regarding clause 7 of your examination report, I have amended the relevant claims accordingly. However, I respectfully submit that almost all examiners do not object to such capital letters at the beginning of the clauses and it makes reading easier. Regarding the term “self-employed employee” I again respectfully submit that it is not really self-contradictory since it refers to the special situation which is enabled by the present invention – being both a self employee and being employed at the united company at the same time – i.e. the application deals directly with enabling what normally would be considered a contradiction but this invention makes it a real possibility, and the meaning of this term is very clear from the context in the specification, however I have amended this as requested. Regarding the use of and/or, I respectfully submit that that it is very clear that it means at least one of the alternatives, and I respectfully submit that using and/or in places such as clause a of claim 1 is actually more clear than using embedded structures of “at least one of”, and examiners in my other patent applications usually do not object to this.
3. Regarding clauses 8-19 of your examination report, I respectfully submit again that the sample bank statement which you quoted from (SPBW) is completely irrelevant since like typical bank statements it contains the name of the person who owns the account and additional details, but this has nothing whatsoever to do with enabling self-employed people to be registered as employees in a united company while keeping an autonomy of self-employed people or with issuing the type of invoices as described in clause a of claims 1 & 11. However, I have amended this clause to make the distinction even more clear.
4. Regarding clauses 20-22 of your examination report, I respectfully submit again that the Piehl patent (US patent 6,898,573) does not talk at all about insurance companies, and in addition the Piehl patent talks about a business

owner who hires a 3rd party tax escrow manager to deal with the taxes of his/her own service providers, whereas claim 21 of the present applications talks about special additional services which insurance companies can offer their agents, without referring to a 3rd party tax manager.

5. Regarding clauses 23-28 of your examination report, I respectfully submit again that the Piehl patent does not refer in Fig. 2-5 to a situation where self employed employees can easily switch from the status of being part of the company to becoming really self employed or to being employed in their own private company or switch back and such switches can be done without substantial changes in at least one of the automatic accounting and/or tracking services, and other services that are offered by the company. The Piehl patent talks about a system for timely payment of taxes, and Fig. 2-5 merely talks about a procedure for making the tax payments. In addition, the word “switch” does not appear at all in the entire Piehl patent. In addition, as explained, above SPBW is also clearly irrelevant, so their combination is also irrelevant anyway.
6. Regarding clauses 29-32 of your examination report, I respectfully submit again that unlike claims 6 and 16 of the present application, <http://web.archive.org/web/20020523141727/http://www.scsc.state.pa.us/> does not talk about the united company of claims 1 and 11 offering self-employed employees additional benefits based on the fact that a large number of self employed-employees are united together. In addition, as explained, above SPBW is also clearly irrelevant, so their combination is also irrelevant anyway.
7. Regarding clauses 33-37 of your examination report, I respectfully submit again that the “how do you begin?” section in http://web.archive.org/web/20030812031413/http://www.amway2u.com/corporate/en_US/amaboutoport.jsp does not refer to an arrangement wherein each self-employed employee that brings to a united company of the type defined in claims 1 and 11 additional people who become self-employed employees there gets at least one of a bonus and more options or stock options. To the best of my understanding Amway is apparently simply a Multi-Level-Marketing (MLM) company, which has nothing to do with the present invention. Similarly, the section “Qualifying for Higher Awards” in that web page is related to the MLM arrangement. In addition, as explained,

above SPBW is also clearly irrelevant, so their combination is also irrelevant anyway.

8. Regarding clauses 38-40 of your examination report, I respectfully submit again that the Membership Eligibility section in http://web.archive.org/web/20030314150221/http://www.cuna.org/gov_affairs/legislative/cu_difference.html does not refer to limiting membership in a united company of the type described in claim 1 and 11 according to the type of profession of self-employed employees as described in claims 10 & 20, and in addition this Membership Eligibility section clearly refers to normal employees of other companies and not to a united company of the type described in claim 1 and 11. In addition, as explained, above SPBW is also clearly irrelevant, so their combination is also irrelevant anyway.
9. In addition, since the independent claims should be allowed, the dependent claims should also be allowed anyway, since they recite additional patentable matter over the independent claims.

Therefore, I respectfully request that a timely notice of allowance be issued in this case. However, I would appreciate it very much if you could contact me in advance (for example by phone to 972-2-5665072 or more preferably by email to aron@vms.huji.ac.il) at least a few days before issuing the notice of allowance in order to give me a chance to make final adjustments in the claims in case I find something that still needs to be improved. Also, if there are further issues that need clarification I would appreciate it very much if you contact me by email before issuing a further office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Yaron Mayer
/Yaron Mayer/

Meir Hadad
/Meir Hadad/